



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,906	02/12/2004	Jonathan James DeMent	AUS920030581US1	6085

7590  
Gregory W. Carr  
670 Founders Square  
900 Jackson Street  
Dallas, TX 75202

03/10/2006

EXAMINER
----------

SCHLIE, PAUL W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2186

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/777,906	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DEMENT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Paul W. Schlie	<b>Art Unit</b> 2186	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 have been examined.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Willis et al. (US 2002/0144079).

As per independent claims 1, 10 and 19, Willis et al. teaches a method and/or apparatus for sharing translation look-aside buffer (TLB) entries among multiple logical processors (ergo multiple concurrent threads of execution within a single physical multi-threaded processor) comprising a valid indicator for each concurrent thread of execution along with a single virtual/effective address tag and corresponding physical/real address for each TLB entry, such that such entries may be maintained by computer program code to be consistent with the defined address mapping of said multiple threads of execution (see abstract, figures 7a-b 9a-c, paragraphs 52, 61, and claim 35). Any limitation not otherwise considered explicitly addressed is considered correspondingly

Art Unit: 2186

clearly inherent in that taught, obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, and/or not sufficient to patentably distinguish over prior art.

5. Claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis et al. (US 2002/0144079) in further in view of Peng et al. (5,680,566).

As per claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-27, being dependent on claim 1, 10, 19, or correspondingly dependent claim inclusively, Willis et al. is considered to explicitly and/or inherently implicitly teach the entirety the claimed invention; however in further support of the rejection, as Peng et al. correspondingly teaches a system and/or method comprising a TLB such that it may be determined if multiple TLB entries exist for a given virtual/effective addresses, and further that such an existing entry may be utilized as the basis of an updated TLB entry for a differing process/thread's entry, although thereby inherently invalidating the previous process and/or thread entry's physical/real address mapping with one looked up in a secondary virtual-to-physical address table (see abstract, columns 3-4 lines 49-9); it would be thereby obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine that explicitly taught by Willis et al. with that explicitly taught by Peng et al. relevant to the claims, for the benefit of enabling the use a single TLB entry for multiple concurrent threads which have been determined to have identical virtual-to-physical address mappings as defined in such a secondary table associated with each process/thread. All limitations not otherwise explicitly addressed are correspondingly considered clearly inherent in that taught,

Art Unit: 2186


obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention, and/or insufficient to patentably distinguish over prior art.

***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul W. Schlie whose telephone number is 571-272-6765, or whose email address is [paul.schlie@uspto.gov]. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 8:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim can be reached on 517-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
PIERRE BATAILLE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
3/2/06